

Application No.: 10/691,389
Response dated May 22, 2006
Office Action dated January 20, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 18, 19, 21, 24-27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mahadev et al. (U.S. 2004/0087253) ("Mahadev"). Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahadev. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14-17, 20, 22, 23 and 28-30 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fails to teach, suggest or disclose "[a] system for manufacturing a hard disk drive head slider comprising: an edge blending jig ... *said edge blending jig is configured to allow said lapping tape to partially wrap a side edge between a front and rear face of each slider...*" (e.g., as described in claim 1).

In its rejection the Office Action cites specifically to the sliders 205b and abrasive tap 203 and generally to the descriptions of Figures 3-6 (paragraphs 20-29) as disclosing the relevant limitations. Applicants disagree.

Applicants would like to first point out that the Mahadev reference is directed to abrading the *corners* of sliders. *See* Abstract of Mahadev. It follows logically that there is no need for Mahadev to disclose the use of lapping tape to *partially wrap* a side edge between a front and rear face of each slider (as described in embodiments of the present application). As discussed below, this is confirmed by the Mahadev reference itself.

Paragraph 20 describes Figure 3 of Mahadev. Paragraph 20 describes the use of an abrasive tape 203 including an abrasive component, and offers examples of the types, widths and thicknesses of tape that may be used (e.g., diamond, etc.). It further describes the use of abrasive

Application No.: 10/691,389
Response dated May 22, 2006
Office Action dated January 20, 2006

tape 203, facing a slider, to move along the path that rubs *adjacent corners* of the single slider. It finally describes using a lubricant to facilitate movement of the tape over the slider body. Figure 3 of Mahadev follows suit, showing the tape 203 exposed along *the corners* of sliders 205. Therefore, Applicants maintain there is no description or illustration in Figure 3 of at least the use of the tape to partially wrap a side edge between a front and rear face of a slider as described in embodiments of the present application.

Paragraph 21 describes Figure 4 of Mahadev. It describes the use of two-sided abrasive tape. It also describes (in Figure 5) using the tape to move from a first corner of a first slider to a first corner of a second slider. There is again no mention of the use of the tape to partially wrap a side edge between a front and rear face of a slider.

Paragraph 22 discloses the lubricant 201.

Paragraphs 23-25 describes an embodiment of the Mahadev application, shown in Figure 5. Applicants submit that that paragraph 23-25 do not contain and teaching, suggestion or disclosure of the tape to *partially wrap a side edge* between a front and rear face of a slider. Furthermore, this is confirmed in Figure 5 itself, wherein the illustration of such a limitation is lacking as well.

Paragraph 26-29 describe the method of processing sliders in Mahadev. Figure 6 is the accompanying flowchart. It describes partially dicing the row sliders, engaging them with a abrasion system (step 403), adjusting the tape (step 405), *running the tape over the corners* between adjacent sliders (step 407), and moving the arms (step 409). The final two steps, 411 and 413, constitute repeating the step 407 – running tape over the *corners*. There is no suggestion of the use of the tape to *partially wrap a side edge* between a front and rear face of a slider.

Application No.: 10/691,389
Response dated May 22, 2006
Office Action dated January 20, 2006

In order to form the basis of a proper 102(e) rejection, any cited reference must disclose each and every limitation of the claims, including the use of lapping tape to *partially wrap a side edge* between a front and rear. Since Mahadev fails to disclose at least the above limitation, it is not sufficient as the basis of a proper 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection. Applicants submit independent claims 18 and 31 contain similar allowable limitations. Depending claims 2-17 and 19-30 are allowable as depending from allowable base claims.

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: May 22, 2006

By: 

Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501